

**LIMIT EQUILIBRIUM AND FINITE ELEMENT –
SHEAR STRENGTH REDUCTION STABILITY
ANALYSIS, KOTA BUNYIH TAILINGS DAM,
PENGKALAN HULU, PERAK, MALAYSIA**

MACLIVE WILKINSON ANAK AGAM

UNIVERSITI SAINS MALAYSIA

2018

**LIMIT EQUILIBRIUM AND FINITE ELEMENT – SHEAR STRENGTH
REDUCTION STABILITY ANALYSIS, KOTA BUNYIH TAILINGS DAM,
PENGKALAN HULU, PERAK, MALAYSIA**

by

MACLIVE WILKINSON ANAK AGAM

**Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Science**

February 2018

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Mohd Hazizan Mohd Hashim for all of the guidance and motivation that he gave to me during the duration of my study. Without his guidance, motivation and tolerance throughout the study, I could not have faced a countless of difficulties and breakdowns. Thus, he is the best supervisor that I ever had. Besides that, I would also like to thank my co-supervisor Dr. Hareyani Zabidi for her helps during the journey of my study.

Apart from that, I am grateful and thankful to my family and the love ones for the numerous supports and patience that they gave to me. Their supports helped to strengthen my fragile spirit whenever I faced the briers and thorns during my journey of completing the thesis.

Besides that, I am very thankful to all of the staffs from School of Materials and Mineral Resources Engineering, USM that had involved in my study, especially Mr. Meor Mohamad Noh. Also, I want to thank Mr. Dziauddin Zainol Abidin from School of Civil Engineering, USM for the helps and lessons that he provided to me while I was conducting the laboratory experiments.

Moreover, I also would like to thank Rahman Hydraulic Tin Sdn. Bhd. and its personnel, especially Mr. Hariyanto Salleh and Mr. Nik Mohd Fazli for allowing and helping me to conduct the desk study and site investigation in Rahman Hydraulic Tin mine.

Last but not least, I would like to gratefully acknowledge the financial supports given by USM Fellowship under Universiti Sains Malaysia and Short Term Grant (60313015) in carrying out this study. The opportunity and supports given by USM are very much appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xiv
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xvi
ABSTRAK	xxii
ABSTRACT	xxiv
CHAPTER ONE : INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Introduction to Kota Bunyih Tailings Dam	1
1.1.1 General Geology of Rahman Hydraulic Tin Mine	4
1.1.2 General Design of Kota Bunyih Tailings Dam	5
1.1.3 Safety Features of Kota Bunyih Tailings Dam	6
1.2 Problem Statements	8
1.3 Objectives of Study	10
1.4 Significance of Study	11
1.5 Approach of Study	12
1.6 Limitation of Study	13
1.7 Thesis Outline	14

CHAPTER TWO : LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	Introduction	16
2.2	Tailings Embankment Design	16
2.3	Factors and Modes of Tailings Dam Failures	18
2.3.1	Liquefaction	19
2.3.1(a)	Static Liquefaction	20
2.3.1(b)	Seismic Liquefaction	22
2.3.2	Piping	23
2.4	Slope Stability Analysis of Tailings Embankments	27
2.4.1	Conditions for Analysis of Tailings Embankments	27
2.4.1(a)	End-of-Construction	28
2.4.1(b)	Long-Term Steady Seepage	28
2.4.1(c)	Rapid Drawdown	29
2.4.2	Fundamental of Groundwater	30
2.4.2(a)	Site Conditions of Groundwater	30
2.4.2(b)	One-Dimensional Groundwater Flow	32
2.4.2(c)	Hydraulic Boundary Conditions	35
2.4.2(d)	Groundwater Flow Through Soil of Different Hydraulic Conductivities	39
2.4.2(e)	Hydraulic Conductivities of Unsaturated Soil	41
2.4.3	Methods of Analysing Slope Stability	43
2.4.3(a)	Limit Equilibrium Methods	43
2.4.3(b)	Finite Element Method – Shear Strength Reduction	54
2.4.4	Slope Stability under Seismic Loading Conditions	60

2.4.4(a) Pseudo-static Seismic Analysis	61
2.4.4(b) Newmark Displacement Analysis	63
2.5 Summary	64

CHAPTER THREE : METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction	66
3.2 Desk Study	67
3.3 Methods and Preparation	69
3.3.1 Sample Collection	69
3.3.2 Laboratory Sampling	71
3.3.3 Geotechnical Laboratory Tests	71
3.4 Modelling	72
3.4.1 Modelling in Slide 7.0	73
3.4.1(a) Steady-State Seepage Analysis	73
3.4.1(b) Normal Condition Pseudo-static Seismic Analysis	83
3.4.1(c) Normal Condition Probabilistic Analysis	86
3.4.2 Modelling in RS2 9.0	89
3.4.2(a) Steady-State Seepage Analysis	89
3.4.2(b) Normal Condition Probabilistic Analysis	94
3.5 Analyses Approaches	96

CHAPTER FOUR : RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction	98
------------------	----

4.2	Qualitative Analysis	99
4.2.1	Geotechnical Laboratory Tests	99
4.2.1(a)	Water Content Test	99
4.2.1(b)	Particle Size Tests	101
4.2.1(c)	Specific Gravity Test	105
4.2.1(d)	Fall Cone Test	107
4.2.1(e)	Hydraulic Conductivity Tests	110
4.2.1(f)	Modified Proctor's Test	116
4.2.1(g)	Consolidated-Drained Triaxial Test	120
4.2.2	Kota Bunyih Tailings Dam Construction Design	122
4.2.2(a)	Tailings Dam Design and Type	123
4.2.2(b)	Geological Characteristics of the Foundation	133
4.2.2(c)	Properties of Kota Bunyih Tailings Dam	135
4.3	Slope Stability Analysis	140
4.3.1	The Factors of Safety of Steady-State Seepage Analysis	145
4.3.2	Steady-State Seepage Condition Analysed in LEM and FEM	147
	SSR	
4.3.3	Normal Condition Pseudo-static Seismic Analysis	154
4.3.4	Probabilistic Analysis	157
4.4	Summary	162

CHAPTER FIVE : CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1	Conclusion	165
5.1.1	Qualitative Analysis of KB Tailings Dam	166

5.1.2	FOS of KB Tailings Dam under Steady-State Seepage and Seismic Conditions	167
5.1.3	Slope reliability of KB Tailings Dam	168
5.2	Recommendation for Future Studies	169
REFERENCES		171

APPENDICES

Appendices A The Procedures of Geotechnical Laboratory Tests	
Appendix B The General Flowchart of Research Activities in Methodology	
Appendices C The Results of Geotechnical Laboratory Tests	
Appendix D	The Similarity of Hydraulic Conditions Between Probabilistic and Steady-State Seepage Analyses for Both Slide 7.0 and RS2 9.0 Programs.

LIST OF PUBLICATION

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 2.1	The initiation, progression and characteristics for types of piping.	25
Table 2.2	The types of boundary condition that may exist in a model of groundwater system and their characteristics.	35
Table 2.3	The characteristics of hydraulic conductivity models of unsaturated soil.	42
Table 2.4	The assumptions and criteria of limit equilibrium methods.	48
Table 2.5	The recommended value of pseudo-static seismic coefficient, after Jibson (2011).	62
Table 2.6	The summary of static condition satisfied by LEM, after Abramson <i>et al.</i> (2002) and Aryal (2006).	65
Table 3.1	Project Settings used in Slide 7.0.	76
Table 3.2	The setting of the first stage modelling in Slide 7.0 steady-state seepage analysis.	76
Table 3.3	Slip surface setting in stage 5.	79
Table 3.4	Setup of hydraulic boundary condition in stage 9.	80
Table 3.5	The hydraulic model parameters assigned to KB tailings dam materials.	82
Table 3.6	The relative minimum and relative maximum of random variables in Slide 7.0.	88
Table 3.7	Project settings used for steady-state seepage analysis in Slide 7.0.	89
Table 3.8	The assumptions made on the strength characteristic of materials.	92
Table 3.9	Mesh and discretization parameter of steady-state seepage analysis in RS2 9.0.	93

Table 3.10	The relative minimum and relative maximum of random variables in RS2 9.0.	96
Table 4.1	Result of water content determination.	100
Table 4.2	Soil classifications of tested samples.	103
Table 4.3	The result of G_s test.	106
Table 4.4	The sample description and penetration time for fall cone test.	107
Table 4.5	The result of fall cone test.	108
Table 4.6	Characteristics of soil based on plasticity indices, after Sibanda <i>et al.</i> (2013).	109
Table 4.7	The property of sample and permeameter used in constant-head test.	111
Table 4.8	The result of constant-head test.	113
Table 4.9	The mould dimension for FH test.	114
Table 4.10	The property of sample used in FH test.	114
Table 4.11	The result of FH test.	115
Table 4.12	The result of water content test for specimen in FH test.	116
Table 4.13	The mould dimension for MPT.	117
Table 4.14	The OMC and MDD of samples.	119
Table 4.15	The result of consolidated-drained triaxial test.	121
Table 4.16	The summary of upstream, downstream and centreline types of raised embankments, modified after Agency (1994) and Vick (1983).	127
Table 4.17	The classification of risk of landslide on hill-site development for natural and man-made slope, after Gue and Tan (2004).	129
Table 4.18	Clay strength based on SPT data, after Look (2007).	134
Table 4.19	Typical m_v derived from SPT-N value, after Look (2007).	135

Table 4.20	The input properties for steady-state seepage analysis and normal condition pseudo-static seismic analysis in LEM and FEM SSR	141
Table 4.21	The minimum, maximum and standard deviation values used for probabilistic analysis in LEM and FEM SSR.	143
Table 4.22	The results of steady-state seepage analysis for LEM.	145
Table 4.23	The results of steady-state seepage analysis for FEM SSR.	145
Table 4.24	The minimum FOS for slopes under steady-state seepage condition, after Duncan and Wright (2005) and Jansen (1988).	147
Table 4.25	Results of normal condition pseudo-static seismic analysis.	155
Table 4.26	The results of probabilistic analysis determined by LEM and FEM SSR.	158

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
Figure 1.1	The location of RHT mining lease area, in Kelian Intan, Perak as indicated by green lines (permission by RHT).	2
Figure 1.2	Geological map of the Kelian Intan area (Ariffin, 2009).	4
Figure 1.3	The north- and south-cut walls surrounding the KB tailings dam. The closed-channel spillway is indicated by the red circle.	6
Figure 2.1	The examples of blanket and chimney drains constructed within Ash Pond Dam, Loy Yang Power Station, Victoria, Australia after Fell <i>et al.</i> (2014).	17
Figure 2.2	The example of liquefaction failure on Lower San Fernando Dam, California, USA, after Association of State Dam Safety Officials (2017)	19
Figure 2.3	The example of piping phenomenon that may occur in an embankment/dam, after Sustainable Geotransportation Infrastructure (2017).	24
Figure 2.4	The illustration of water infiltration and the recharges of groundwater, after USGS (2016).	30
Figure 2.5	Groundwater flow in a soil profile, after Coduto (1999).	32
Figure 2.6	The boundary conditions of a modelled embankment, after Franke <i>et al.</i> (1987); boundary ABC, EFG is constant-head boundary conditions, boundary HI is streamline boundary condition, boundary CD is free-surface boundary condition, and DE is seepage-surface boundary condition.	36
Figure 2.7	A model of groundwater showing the head-dependent flux boundary condition indicated by boundary AB, after Franke <i>et al.</i> (1987).	36
Figure 2.8	The assigned boundary conditions to a slope model to predict groundwater flow, after Rahimi <i>et al.</i> (2010).	37
Figure 2.9	The 3D model of groundwater flow in Bengal Basin, after Zahid <i>et al.</i> (2015).	38

Figure 2.10	The flow nets at the boundary of soils with different hydraulic conductivities, after Cedergren (1989).	40
Figure 2.10 (A)	$k_2 < k_1$.	40
Figure 2.10 (B)	$k_2 > k_1$.	40
Figure 2.11	Example of free body diagram of partially submerged composite/non-homogeneous slope, after Fredlund and Krahn (1977).	44
Figure 2.12	The example of uniform triangle mesh in FEM, after Rocscience (2014).	55
Figure 2.13	The action of seismic coefficient in pseudo-static slope stability analysis, after Bray and Travasarou (2009).	61
Figure 3.1	The middle cross-section of the KB tailings dam.	68
Figure 3.2	Steady-state Seepage modelling in Slide 7.0.	75
Figure 3.3	Normal condition pseudo-static modelling stages in Slide 7.0.	85
Figure 3.4	Normal condition probabilistic modelling stages in Slide 7.0.	87
Figure 3.5	Steady-state seepage modelling stages in RS2 9.0.	90
Figure 3.6	Normal condition probabilistic modelling stages in RS2 9.0.	95
Figure 4.1	The PSD of tested samples.	102
Figure 4.2	The dry density against moisture content plot for MPT.	117
Figure 4.3	The cross-section model of KB tailings dam.	124
Figure 4.4	General slope geometry, after Gue and Tan (2004).	128
Figure 4.5	The washing of finer particle had occurred across the rock toe as indicated by the red circle.	131
Figure 4.6	The geometry of KB tailings dam on 11 th March 2014 (accessed on 4 th December 2016). The straight yellow lines indicate the initial bench alignment.	132

- Figure 4.7 The geometry of KB tailings dam on 13th May 2014 (accessed 132
on 4th December 2016). The yellow line indicates an imaginary
straight line while the curve red line indicates the current bench
alignment.
- Figure 4.8 The cross-section of KB tailings dam showing the location of 149
high hydraulic gradient, high matric suction, perched
groundwater and groundwater table.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

2D	two-dimensional
3D	three-dimensional
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
BS	British Standard
CSS	critical slip surface
FEA	finite element analysis
FEM	finite element method
FH	falling-head
FOS	factor of safety
FOS _F	FOS with respect to force equilibrium
FOS _M	FOS with respect to moment equilibrium
GLE	General Limit Equilibrium
KB	Kota Bunyih
LEM	limit equilibrium methods
M	earthquake magnitude
MDD	maximum dry density (Mg/m ³)
MODFLOW	3D finite-difference groundwater analysis by United States Geological Survey
MP	Morgenstern and Price
MPT	modified Proctor's test
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service

OMC	optimum moisture content (%)
PF	probability of failure (%)
PGA	peak ground acceleration (m/s^2)
PSD	particle size distribution
PVC	polyvinyl chloride
RF	Rossi-Forel earthquake intensity scale
RHT	Rahman Hydraulic Tin
RI	reliability index
RS2 9.0	2D finite element stress analysis program by Rocscience Inc.
SEEP/W	finite element seepage analysis by Geo-slope International Limited
Slide 7.0	2D limit equilibrium slope stability analysis program by Rocscience Inc.
SLOPE/W	Slope stability software for soil and rock slopes by Geo-slope International Limited
SPT	standard penetration test
SRF	strength reduction factor
SSR	shear strength reduction
USCS	Unified Soil Classification System
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USGS	United States Geological Survey
USM	Universiti Sains Malaysia

LIST OF SYMBOLS

A	resultant water forces with subscripts L and R indicates the left and right sides, respectively (N)
a	perpendicular distance from the resultant water force to the centre of rotation with subscripts L and R indicates the left and right sides, respectively (m)
a_h	horizontal ground acceleration (m/s^2)
B_s	Skempton's parameter, the ratio of change in pore water pressure over change in cell pressure in triaxial cell
c	Value of intersection between water content axis and power trend line of water content against penetration depth plot (%)
c'	effective cohesion/electrostatic forces over fine particles (kPa)
c^*	factored cohesion (kPa)
C_c	coefficient of curvature
C_u	coefficient of uniformity
D_{10}	grain size at 10% particle size distribution curve (mm)
D_{15}	grain size at 15% particle size distribution curve, the particle capture capacity of filter soil (mm)
D_{30}	grain size at 30% particle size distribution curve (mm)
D_{50}	median grain size at 50% particle size distribution curve (mm)
D_{60}	grain size at 60% particle size distribution curve (mm)
D_{85}	grain size at 85% particle size distribution curve, the erosion parameter of the protected/base soil (mm)
d	perpendicular distance of the line load to the centre of rotation (m)

E	horizontal interslice forces with subscripts L and R indicates the left and right sides, respectively (N)
e	vertical distance from the centroid of each slice to centre of rotation (m)
f	perpendicular offset of the normal force from the centre of rotation (m)
F_h	horizontal driving force (N)
$f(x)$	a function that determine the behaviour (direction) of X/E across the slope
g	gravitational acceleration (m/s^2)
G_s	specific gravity of soil
H	total head (m)
h	height of slice (m)
H_e	height of embankment (m)
h_f	distance between the overflow outlet of the basin and the final level of water on burette in falling-head test (mm)
h_L	readings of lower manometer in constant-head test (m)
H_L	localised height of slope (m)
h_o	distance between the overflow outlet of the basin and the 0 mL mark on the burette in falling-head test (mm)
h_p	pressure head (m)
H_T	total height of slope (m)
h_U	readings of upper manometer in constant-head test (m)
h_z	elevation head (m)
i	hydraulic gradient of groundwater, the subscripts x and z represent the hydraulic gradient components in x and z directions

K	seismic coefficient for horizontal force
k	hydraulic conductivity of soil (m/s). The subscripts x and z represents the hydraulic conductivities in x and z directions respectively. The subscripts 1 and 2 represent the hydraulic conductivities of soil 1 and soil 2, respectively
k_e	effective hydraulic conductivity (m/s)
k_r	relative hydraulic conductivity
k_T	hydraulic conductivity of soil at temperature T (cm/s)
k_{20}	hydraulic conductivity of soil at 20°C (cm/s)
L_L	magnitude of line load (uniform load on the surface) in force per unit width (N/m)
LL	liquid limit (%)
l	length of base of slice (m)
l_s	distance or length of soil where groundwater flow (m)
m	slope (absolute value) of power trend line of water content against penetration depth plot
ML	inorganic sandy silt
m_v	coefficient of volume of compressibility (kPa ⁻¹)
P	total normal force on the base of slice over a length l (N/m)
PI	plasticity index (%)
PL	plastic limit (%)
R	radius associated with mobilised shear force (m)
r	empirical (curve fitting) parameters in Van Genuchten's hydraulic conductivity model
R_T	ratio of u_T/u_{20}

r_u	pore water pressure ratio or ratio of pore water pressure over overburden pressure
S_e	degree of effective saturation
SM	silty sand
S_m	mobilised shear strength on the base of slice (kPa)
SW-SM	well-graded sand with silt
SP	poorly graded sand
T	temperature (°C)
u	pore water pressure (kN/m ²)
U_R	pore water pressure force (N)
u_T	viscosity of water at temperature T (poise)
u_{20}	viscosity of water at 20°C (poise)
v	water flow velocity for the cross section area normal to the direction of flow (m/s). The subscripts x and z represents the water flow velocity components in the x and z directions, respectively
W	total weight of the slice of width b and height h (N)
w	weight of soil (kN)
x	horizontal distance of the slice from the centre of rotation (m)
X	vertical interslice forces with subscripts L and R indicates the left and right sides, respectively (N)
$[B]$	matrix that dependant on the nodal point coordinates
$[D]$	matrix that defines the relationship between stress and strain components (in terms of shear and bulk moduli) based on the behaviour of the soil being modelled
$[f]$	matrix of generalised displacement

$[N]$	matrix that dependant on the shapes and size of element
$[\delta]$	matrix of nodal point displacement
$[\varepsilon_e]$	matrix of strain of element
$[\sigma_e]$	matrix of stress of element
α	angle between the slice base and the horizontal ($^{\circ}$)
α_f	initial angle of flowlines ($^{\circ}$)
α_G	global angle of slope ($^{\circ}$)
α_L	localised angle of slope ($^{\circ}$)
β	deflected angle of flowlines ($^{\circ}$)
γ_w	unit weight of water (kN/m^3)
ΔH	total head loss across the flow domain (m)
θ_Q	slope of resultant of pair of interslice forces ($^{\circ}$)
κ_A, κ_B and κ_C	empirical (curve fitting) parameters in Fredlund and Xing's hydraulic conductivity model (kPa)
λ	a scale factor of the function
λ_p	pore size distribution index (positive)
ρ	soil density (kg/m^3)
σ'	effective stress (kN/m^2)
σ_1'	major effective principal stress (kN/m^2)
σ_3'	minor effective principal stress (kN/m^2)
τ	shear strength/stress (kPa)
φ	matric suction (kPa)
φ_b	bubbling pressure/air entry value (kPa)

ϕ'	effective friction angle of soil ($^{\circ}$)
ϕ^*	factored friction angle ($^{\circ}$)
ω	angle of the line load from the horizontal ($^{\circ}$)

ANALISIS KESTABILAN SECARA KESEIMBANGAN HAD DAN UNSUR TERHINGGA – PENGURANGAN KEKUATAN RICIH DI EMPANGAN AMANG KOTA BUNYIH, PENGKALAN HULU, PERAK, MALAYSIA

ABSTRAK

Satu kajian kestabilan cerun empangan amang Kota Bunyih (KB), Pengkalan Hulu dilaksanakan bertujuan untuk menganalisis secara kualitatif kebolehpercayaan terhadap empangan amang KB dan menentukan nilai faktor keselamatan (FOS) dalam muatan keadaan resapan mantap dan keadaan seismik menggunakan Kaedah Keseimbangan Had (LEM) dan Kaedah Unsur Terhingga-Pengurangan Kekuatan Ricih (FEM SSR). Selain itu, penentuan kebarangkalian kegagalan (PF) empangan amang KB turut dilakukan menggunakan analisis kebarangkalian LEM dan FEM SSR. Analisis kualitatif terhadap reka bentuk empangan amang KB dilaksanakan berdasarkan kajian dalam pejabat, penyiasatan lapangan dan ujian makmal geoteknik. Program Slide 7.0 dan RS2 9.0 digunakan untuk menjalankan analisis berketentuan dan kebarangkalian empangan amang KB dalam pelbagai beban berdasarkan data-data geoteknikal sampel yang diperolehi. Berdasarkan analisis kualitatif, reka bentuk empangan amang KB didapati sedikit menyimpang dari reka bentuk piawai dan menyebabkan takungan air pada lokasi tertentu yang berkemungkinan meningkatkan risiko fenomena hakisan dalaman. Tambahan pula, berdasarkan taburan saiz partikel sampel tanah empangan amang KB yang diuji, didapati bahawa agregat “*New Earth Blanket*” dan “*New Dam*” tidak memenuhi kriteria ketiga reka bentuk penapis. Namun demikian, semua nilai faktor keselamatan (FOS) yang diperolehi daripada analisis resapan berkeadaan mantap berdasarkan kaedah LEM dan FEM memberikan nilai $FOS > 1.5$ dan dikategorikan sebagai

selamat. Analisis seismik pseudo-statik FOS yang diperolehi (FOS=1.22) untuk cerun hilir didapati kurang sedikit berbanding nilai minimum 1.25 yang dicadangkan. Analisis kebarangkalian menggunakan kaedah-kaedah Spencer, Sarma dan FEM SSR memberikan nilai-nilai PF bukan sifar. Walau bagaimanapun, nilai-nilai PF yang diberikan adalah sangat kecil ($< 1\%$) yang menunjukkan bahawa hanya segelintir permukaan gelinciran kritikal mempunyai $FOS < 1.5$ dan tidak mempengaruhi kestabilan secara langsung. Secara keseluruhan, walaupun kestabilan cerun empangan amang KB dianggap selamat berdasarkan analisis resapan berkeadaan mantap dan kebarangkalian, kestabilan cerun empangan KB didapati kurang memuaskan berdasarkan analisis kualitatif dan seismik pseudo-statik, dan perlu diberi perhatian yang lebih pada masa akan datang.